

April 3, 1987

LB 661, 661A, 753

CLERK: (Read record vote as found on page 1482-83 of the Legislative Journal.) 42 ayes, 0 nays, 2 present and not voting, 5 excused and not voting, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BARRETT: LB 753 passes. Moving to Item 7 on the agenda, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Warner would move to suspend Rule 8, Section 5 so as to permit consideration of 661 and 661A on Final Reading today.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Warner, please.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, LB 661, you will recall, is the bill that establishes a process for negotiations between state government and state employee groups, organizations. It carries the emergency clause, but it also has an A bill in the amount of, for '87-88, of \$207,000 General Fund appropriation for the Department of Personnel, about \$3,241 for the Commission on Industrial Relations, and \$30,000 appropriated to the Attorney General's office which is for the type of activity that LB 71 had, but is also a part of LB 661. The reason for asking for the suspension of the rules, to be able to read this bill now, which does have a fiscal impact in '87-88, is that negotiations can commence under the...or will commence, rather, under the provisions of LB 661, commencing September 1 of 1987 of this year. There is concern, particularly among the employee groups, because it does take, no doubt will take a significant period of time for the restructuring of the organizations that currently exist to comply with the kinds of structure that LB 661 would require. The bill needs to be enacted so that they could proceed with that process and have an orderly, more orderly negotiation coming September 1, when the bill...or when the negotiations could take effect if the bill was enacted. I'm always hesitant to ask to move a bill ahead on this basis, but because of the desirability, at least, if not the necessity of providing ample time for these groups to restructure their organizations, and the bill does carry the emergency clause, why I think it would be helpful if the bill was passed now. That is the reason for the request. I would move the adoption of the rule...suspension in order that the bill could be read.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Any discussion on the Warner motion to suspend the rules? If not, those in favor of the